



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2020

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2020-19372

Dear Mr. Meitler:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 840384 (ORR# 42687).

The Texas Education Agency ("TEA") received a request for information pertaining to a specified complaint. TEA states it is redacting some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ TEA also states it will withhold information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) and Open Records Letter Nos. 2016-04398 (2016) and 2020-03195 (2020).² TEA informs us it has released some of the requested information,

¹ The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

² Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under

but claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.116 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

TEA acknowledges the submitted information contains a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body” unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly confidential under the Act or “other law.” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address TEA’s claim under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Rule 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. Open Records Letter No. 2020-03195 authorizes TEA to withhold all information and materials subpoenaed or compiled by TEA in connection with an investigation described by section 21.062(a) of the Education Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.062(d) of the Education Code, so long as other state or federal law does not permit access to the information, without the necessity of again requesting an attorney general decision with regard to the applicability of this exception. Open Records Letter No. 2016-04398 authorizes TEA to withhold public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

³ We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.* 192.5; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8 (2002). In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORR 677 at 7.

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the attorney work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993))); *see also* *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) (holding "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

TEA inform us it "regulates and oversees all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and enforcement of standards of conduct for certified educators in Texas public schools under the authority of [c]hapter 21 of the Education Code." *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a), .041. TEA also explains it litigates enforcement proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.3. TEA states the information it has marked under rule 192.5 consists of the entire case file pertaining to its investigation of alleged educator misconduct. It also states the file was created by attorneys, legal staff, and other representatives of TEA in anticipation of litigation. Based on these representations, we conclude TEA may withhold the information it has marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

TEA asserts the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) consists of confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of TEA that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find TEA has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to this information. Therefore, TEA may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides,

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. TEA states the remaining information consists of audit working papers prepared or maintained by its Division of Governance and Investigations. TEA explains these audits are authorized by section 39.057(a)(16) of the Education Code. Educ. Code § 39.057 (listing circumstances in which TEA commissioner shall authorize investigations). Based on these representations and our review, we agree the information at issue consists of audit working papers for purposes of section 552.116. Therefore, TEA may withhold the remaining information under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

In summary, TEA may withhold the information it has marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. TEA may also withhold the information it has marked under sections 552.107 and 552.116 of the Government Code.

TEA also this office to issue a previous determination that would permit it to withhold certain information under section 552.116 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, this letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us. Therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 840384

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)